

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/624,136	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> James W. Rogers, Ph.D.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1618	

**All Participants:**

(1) James W. Rogers, Ph.D.

(2) Marcia S. Kelbon.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 28 June 2007

**Time:** 1:00 PM and 2:00 PM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*All pending*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Rogers called Mrs. Kelbon on the 28th of June to discuss a proposed examiners amendment to the claims that would place the claims in condition for a provisional allowance. The examiner also informed applicants counsel that the next office action would be an election restriction but the examiner found allowable material for one of the inventions, therefore the examiner proposed an amendment so the invention could be in a state for a provisional allowance. The proposed amendments would include the phrase "inclusion complex" in claims 12 and 46 to better define applicant's invention and claims 85-90 would be amended to depend upon the hydrogel drug delivery system of claim 12. Also claims 47-56,70-82,84,91-103 will be cancelled. Mrs. Kelbon agreed to the examiners proposed amendments above and agreed to cancel claims 47-56,70-82,84,91-103 and file a divisional(s) application(s) from this application at a later date in order to prosecute the inventions of those claims. On the 29th of June the examiner again contacted Mrs. Kelbon about the new amendment to the specification filed 05/21/2007, the examiner alerted Mrs. Kelbon that there appeared to be a typographical error in the body of the specification where the MW 2,000 was replaced with 20,000, which Mrs. Kelbon acknowledged..